

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:19 p.m., **Wednesday, May 5, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Shakil Patel

Commissioners Absent: Eric Essex

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the items be taken out of order and that Item 2, Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-006 (Mission Development) Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 (TT) No. 03-005 be heard first followed by the discussion on the Draft General Plan. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to address Item 2 under New Items, Public Hearing at the beginning of the meeting.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Director Woldruff requested that the Planning Commission allow Mr. Peter Cowley to present his comments and concern regarding the earlier presentation by the Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC). She apologized to Mr. Cowley because he was did not received an agenda for that item, which was the one he was most interested in; therefore he arrived late because of the oversight.

Chair Neff stated that the Commission had no objections and would accept Mr. Cowley's public testimony.

Mr. Peter Cowley, 24979 Starr Street, Loma Linda thanked the Commission for allowing him to speak on the subject of the LLU presentation. He stated that he had some concerns with the Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC). He continued to say that it was his understanding that the public review period for the Environmental Impacts Report (EIR) would close on May 6, 2004 and that it did not seem appropriate to close a period of public review before residents could respond to the document, and requested that the review period be left open until more information was received regarding the LLUAHSC project.

Director Woldruff explained to Mr. Cowley that the General Plan EIR comment period would end on May 6, 2004 but that under the Permit Streamlining Act staff must process any and all project applications submitted. She added that the City would consider Mr. Cowley's comments.

Mr. Cowley asked if it was the City's intention to grant imminent domain to the Loma Linda University Medical Center and seize residents' private homes. Director Woldruff referred to a map provided by the LLUAHSC and explained that the colored areas pictured on the map represented a general area for the proposed project and it was not intended to appear that LLUAHSC or the City would exercise imminent domain on people's properties.

Mr. Cowley concluded his comments with a statement that he was not in favor of the mixed-use designation because he feared that Loma Linda University Medical Center would build a three-story building or a parking lot adjacent to his home.

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that she had assured Mr. Cowley that he would receive a copy of the agenda when the Loma Linda University Medical Center submitted a formal application for the project.

NEW ITEM

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-25 - ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-006 (MISSION DEVELOPMENT) TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 16323 (TT) NO. 03-005 - Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 is a residential subdivision creating 95 single-family residential lots. The subdivision also includes two additional lots for existing homes and additional lettered lots for parks and open space. The proposal also includes a Zone Change (ZC No. 03-006) to change the zoning from Single Family Residential (R-1) to Planned Community (PC). The project will include a Planned Community Document for the small lot subdivision proposal, to replace the traditional zoning and development standards. A development agreement will be required for the affordable housing requirement. Site layout and design is not proposed at this time. The project is located south of Mission Road, west of and including the Edison Easement and west of California Street in the City of Loma Linda and County of San Bernardino (APN 0292-112-03, 04, 14, 15).

Senior Planner Lamson gave the staff report. She described the proposal as a small lot subdivision, which implemented concepts of the livable walkable community model and neo-traditional neighborhoods supported by the Planning Commission. She added that the 15 acres are proposed to be subdivided into 97 lots for the purpose of constructing 95 single-family homes and included the Edison Easement, which is approximately 5 acres. Senior Planner Lamson explained that an additional quarter acre was made up of the pocket park on the northern part of the tract and the pockets of open space and trails throughout the project area, which connect to the larger regional trail system as well as provide access within the tract and to surrounding development.

Senior Planner Lamson continued her report and explained that the proposed density of the project was 6.3 dwelling units per acre, which is within the existing General Plan that allows for 5.1 to 10 d.u. per acre, and the Draft General Plan, which allows for 5.1 to 9 d.u. per acre for its medium density designations. She stated that the lot sizes ranged from approximately 2,067 to 3,793 square feet and added that there were two existing single-family residences fronting Mission Road within the map area that would not be removed or altered.

Senior Planner Lamson continued her report to say that the project required a zone change from single family to Planned Community, which is consistent with the Draft General Plan. She pointed out that the existing zoning was not consistent with the existing General Plan designation but that the General Plan always prevailed. Ms. Lamson stated that the proposal only included the tract map and the site design. She added that the layout for future housing was not being proposed with this submittal; however, the applicant had provided conceptual layout and house designs.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that a Planned Community document was part of the zone change request to provide the development standards for the project and included a Development Agreement for the payment of in lieu fees to the City for future affordable housing needs in the City.

Ms. Lamson informed the Planning Commission that the project was submitted to the Historical Commission for their review and the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness due to the project's location in the Mission Historic Overlay District. She added that the Historical Commission approved the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: 1) that lots 32 and 33, 34 and 35 be combined into two larger lots facing Mission Road with side loaded access, or that the four lots be converted into open space along Mission Road; 2) the troughs in the old shed/barns on the old dairy site be moved into the Edison Easement for use as planters or something similar if they are safe for public use. Ms. Lamson reported that the Historical Commission also recommended that the Planning Commission and the City Council reduce the density of the project and future projects in the area. She explained that this would mean a change in both the existing and Draft General Plan land use designations since this project complies with the approved range of density.

Senior Planner Lamson reported that the applicant has redesigned the northern portion of the tract to increase the size of the two lots adjacent to Mission Road and to provide frontage on Mission Road with side loaded access, as requested by the Historical Commission. She continued to say that an open space area divided the two lots creating a wide lot appearance from Mission Road and that they would be maintained by the Homeowners' Association. In addition to widening the two lots, the applicant also revised the right-of-way width to the northern portion by providing sidewalks and a 5-foot parkway on each street to provide access around the tract for utilities as well as pedestrians.

Ms. Lamson reported that the Public Works Department had concerns about the size of the roads, but the project was designed with the livable walkable communities concepts as directed by the Planning Commission and part of the concepts did provide for narrower streets, which are provided by the Planned Community zone. She added that Public Safety had indicated that they could provide access through and into the proposed development.

Senior Planner Lamson concluded her report and informed the Planning Commission that once the discussion turned to the review of the conditions, staff recommended that the conditions set by the Historical Commission be added, and an additional condition related to the reimbursement of fees for the Development Agreement.

Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:35 pm.

Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Avenue addressed the Commission and thanked them for the opportunity to present the Mission Lane project. He also thanked staff for their patience during the many revisions. He then introduced the engineer for the project, Mr. John Goodman, of Goodman & Associates, and Mr. John Snell of American Pacific Homes.

Mr. Elssmann provided a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the plans for the Mission Lane project. He stated that the project had a very linear orientation. He continued to say that the project encompassed 15 acres and that the biggest challenge from the design point of view was the narrow distance between the property and the right-of-way of the Southern California Edison easement. He added that it was a very short distance and doesn't allow for a tremendous creativity and dynamics but at the same time offering a great amount of open space.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out prominent gateway features and as part of the approval of Mission Trails, Ryland Homes, already under construction, was the creation of an island to provide a safe area to cross Van Leuven Street. He added that they were able to save the Beaumont Avenue Bridge and have relocated it on their property. He continued to say that the project had connections to Mission Trails at various points that would allow this new community to gain access to a regional trails system, which was made up of five or six miles of trails. He added that they had worked with their neighbor to the west to make sure that local residents would be able to connect and use the trail system.

Mr. Elssmann used the opportunity to show some of the specific elements of the project. He continued to explain that on the north side of Van Leuven, the plan was modified at the Historical Commission's recommendation to safeguard historical resources by eliminating a lot and reoriented the house so the access would be from the interior street not from Mission Road. Mr. Elssmann explained that an entrance into the community was designed from Pepper Way creating a one-way loop.

Mr. Elssmann continued his presentation pointing out that on the south side the plans provided the additional parking spaces, ample room for emergency apparatus, a secondary connection to Mission Trails. He stated that it was their intention to replace the citrus being eliminated from the project site, possibly provide a community garden, open space, homes will have wrought iron fences to match the green wrought iron fencing in Mission Trails, and a trail crossing on Van Leuven. He reiterated that the park space was a public park accessible to all members of the communities.

Mr. Elssmann turned the focus of the project to the conceptual architecture. He commented that the south side would have a parkway in the front just as the north side did. Mr. Elssmann stated that when the project was brought forward in a PPD, the different architectural styles would be presented in full detail. He pointed out that each house would have a gate instead of side yard fences with an easement area that would allow the homeowners the use of a larger area that exceeded the usable side yard space in Mission Trails, and a shielded space for the trash containers.

Mr. Elssmann commented on the Conditions of Approval stating that he had few questions but would wait until the Planning Commission's discussion on the issue.

Mr. Elssmann concluded his presentation stating that, as pointed out in staff's report, the project was in conformance with the existing General Plan and the draft General Plan, and added that this community, managed by a Homeowners' Association, would be responsible for overseeing the maintenance of the largest public space that the City of Loma Linda had to date. He further added that the public open spaces would be privately maintained and all rules enforced by the Homeowners' Association. He commented that he anticipated that the sale prices would be in the range of \$250,000.

Chair Neff opened the public comment at 8:05 pm and opened the discussion to the Planning Commission beginning with the issue of the density of the proposed project.

Peter Cowley, 24979 Starr Street, Loma Linda, commented that, in this type of project with such a high density parking, on a 32-foot wide street, would be inadequate for guests. He continued to say that the other concerns as far as the idea of a dog park and the space between the houses as illustrated on the slides shown earlier. Senior Planner Lamson responded to Mr. Cowley's concerns stating that the concepts of the dog park and the community gardens, along with the designs of the homes were not part of the approval of this project at this time. Director Woldruff added that through the PPD process, the Parks, Recreation, and Beautification and Trails Development committees would review the plans for those items.

Chair Neff requested that Mr. Elssmann respond to Mr. Cowley's concerns. Mr. Elssmann introduced Mr. John Snell, Vice President of the American Pacific Homes who would also bring to the Planning Commission a development in that area.

John Snell, Vice President of the American Pacific Homes, stated that his company builds a variety of projects of different types throughout the Inland Empire. He addressed the parking issue stating that the CCR's would require that the garages be used exclusively for parking cars, and that the owners would not be allowed to park in the driveway or the street and the Homeowners' Association would establish a parking program with stickers, guest passes, and a tow committee. He commented that the sales representatives would be fully aware of those issues and would pass them on to the prospective buyers. He stated that the HOA would be established after the first home was sold, with regularly scheduled HOA meetings and enforcement starting immediately after the house is occupied.

Ms. Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, stated that she was a member of the Historical Commission and explained that the mission of the Commission was to set goals to maintain the historical flavor of the city. She continued to say that the density of Mr. Elssmann's project was way too large to fit within what Loma Linda has been. She requested that the Planning Commission look at the number of homes and stated that the potential for decay within a neighborhood that only had six feet between each home was powerful. She added that if the project were approved, it would set a precedent that would allow other developments of this type to be built.

Mr. James Shipp, 11553 Cedar Way, Chair of the Historical Commission, stated that the City had only one California State official landmark and that it was the Guachama Rancheria and that he expected that a large number of residents would like to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the naming of the City of Loma Linda. He continued to say that it was the oldest pre-historic and historic site, he asked that the Planning Commission to maintain an awareness of that and ask if the project celebrated and show adequate respect to the oldest site. He also commented that the developer readily responded to the Commission's comments concerning the orientation of the homes facing the Guachama marker. Mr. Shipp pointed out that other members of the Historical Commission were concerned with the density and reminded the Commission that the project site was in close proximity to the most historic spot of the City.

Mr. Barry Wood, 10872 Pepper Way, addressed the Commission to say that the developer was exaggerating when he reported that the project was being built on 15 acres when truly it was proposed on a 10-acre site. He added that the calculated density was much higher than reported. Director Woldruff replied to Mr. Wood that even on the 10-acre property the project was within the density allowable by the general Plan and the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Richard Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, commented on that there were four two-story units facing Pepper Way from the direction of the Mountain View Town Homes. He suggested that the developer could consider building single-story homes to allow current homeowners to maintain their view of the mountains.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that the density calculation, with or without the 5 acres in the Edison easement, would still comply with the 5.1 to 9 units per acre requirement in the draft General Plan and the 5.1 to 10 units in the existing General Plan. She further explained that because of the location and the shape of the project site, staff viewed the project as a transitional density project going from a very high density with the apartments and town homes to the west, to a medium density for the proposed project, to a somewhat lower but still a medium density in the tract to the east.

Director Woldruff suggested that the Commission look at this project as a detached condominium project or town home project. She explained that this type of project had become more prevalent than condominium or town home project of the past, due to the fact that condominium and town home projects had become cost prohibitive. High insurance costs make condo and town project

much more difficult to build. She stated that the common wall of a condominium and town home is the issue in high insurance costs to the developer.

On a question by Commissioner Rosenbaum regarding affordable housing unit requirements, Ms. Lamson explained that the developer was opting to pay an in-lieu fee to assist the City with future affordable housing projects in all areas of the City through a Development Agreement.

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested clarification on the reason for the review of a Planned Community document. Senior Planner Lamson described the need for the Planned Community document and explained that the current zoning of the project site did not comply with the existing General Plan designation; therefore changing the zoning to a planned community zone would be compatible with underlying zoning required a Planned Community document.

Chair Neff invited the applicant, Mr. Glenn Elssmann to address the public comments presented earlier.

The applicant, Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Avenue addressed the Planning Commission and stated that Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) were a very effective tool to address the parking questions. He added that there was parking on the south side on both sides of the street, and a one-way street with parking on one side facing those homes.

Mr. Elssmann stated that he appreciated Mr. Shipp's presentation on behalf of the Historical Commission pointing out the historic landmark across the street from the project, and added that he would work with the Historical Commission to create a wide gateway entrance to form a view corridor that would provide a better focus for the historical resources located along Mission Road.

Mr. Elssmann stated he would like to reserve the name of "Silva" for the entrance on the north side of the project. He pointed out that the name was on the City's approved list of street names. He added that Frank Silva was the son of the original owner who operated a chicken ranch. He concluded by saying that he believed that the architecture of the project must be appropriate for the style of the Mission Road area.

Chair Neff requested clarification on a comment made earlier regarding the characteristics of the north end of the project compared to those of the south end.

Mr. Elssmann explained that the slide represented the north side of the project in the area of the park and that the addition that would be made in this area would be a parkway and the trees that would be actually very representative of the north side.

Chair Neff asked if Mr. Elssmann had any concerns about parking in the vicinity of the public park. Mr. Elssmann replied that the park had been designed as a neighborhood park to fit in with the trail system that would connect with tracts to the east and the west and that he envisioned the majority of users would be residents of the adjacent community that could access the parks on foot, and added that the parking would be ample for visitors from other areas.

Commissioner Rosenbaum had a concern regarding the requirement for the owners to park their cars in the garage and not use the garage for storage and how this would be addressed for families that have more than two vehicles. Ms. Lamson replied if the CCR's were approved in line with what Mr. Snell was indicating, that would be the case. She added that staff would have to consult with the City Attorney on the issue of restricting anyone from parking on a city street. Ms. Lamson concurred with Commissioner Rosenbaum that the issue would come up again during the PPD discussion and added that the only issues about parking at this stage would relate to parking only on one side of the one-way street and no parking on the street that connects on the southern portion of the project to Mission Trails.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know if there would be a sufficient number of parking spaces for the size of the tract. Chair Neff added to Commissioner Christianson's question to say that it would be very inconvenient for guests to park on Mission Road when they are visiting someone in one of the interior streets.

Mr. Elssmann replied that there was room for at least one car in front of every home with parking on both sides of the street plus spaces in the owner's driveway. Commissioner Christianson received confirmation that there would be parking on both sides of the street on the southern part of the tract that include the six units that have a median in front of their property.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he considered that the idea of having parking on two sides of a 32-foot wide street was very frightening. In response, Senior Planner Lamson gave the example of the project to the east that had 28-foot wide street and parking on both sides.

Commissioner Christianson received confirmation that the street on the north loop was a one-way street. He continued to make certain that he understood that the owners of the house on Lot #28, would have to drive around the whole loop to get to the driveway. Mr. Elssmann addressed Commissioner Christianson's concern and explained that the one-way street was designed to be a traffic-calming feature.

Chair Neff stated that the concerns he had regarding the right-of-way width, location of utilities and so forth had been addressed in the new plans submitted at the meeting. Associate Engineer Peterson concurred with Chair Neff's comments as he also had some serious reservations with the north half of the project because of the extremely narrow right-of-ways that would not provide adequate room for sidewalks, streetlights, and fire hydrants. He added that however, the applicant had addressed those concerns and would leave it up to the Planning Commission to use their discretion as to what they feel was appropriate.

Chair Neff asked Fire Chief Rolland Crawford for his comments concerning the access to the north area for emergency apparatus as well as the long linear lines of the tract itself to the south. Chief Crawford explained that his department recognized that this particular piece of property had some pretty severe limitations especially with the Edison easement and met with Mr. Elssmann and Mr. Goodman, their Engineer on numerous occasions to work through various options. He continued to say that the overall concept of the neo-traditional, with narrower streets had been directed by the Planning Commission and worked to address some of the concerns. The developer proposed a long north/south street that would be 32 feet from curb to curb and it was consistent with what was approved for the Granite Homes tract, which is now known as Laurel Heights. Laurel Heights does have parking on both sides but it also has shorter blocks. The north section has also gone through redesigns to take a very close look at the turning radii and significant adjustments were made to the corners so that we believe we are able to accommodate our fire apparatus. The developer also added an emergency access pathway to accommodate the concerns. He concluded to say that developer and the engineer had been addressed all of them.

Chair Neff asked if there would be sidewalks on both side of the street. Mr. Elssmann replied that there were sidewalks on both sides of tree-lined streets as well as a parkway. He added that there would not be parking adjacent to the park, which illustrates how the one-way street configuration works.

A discussion ensued regarding the Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements. Mr. Elssmann explained that the side use easement eliminated the side fence between the homes and the livable area did not look out onto a fence. He added that the area would be landscaped and the Homeowners' Association would be responsible for ensuring that structures are not attached to the neighboring house. Mr. Elssmann reassured the Commission that the houses would comply with the UBC.

Chair Neff verified that both properties were in effect sharing the 6-foot side yard. Mr. Elssmann confirmed that that was correct.

Commissioner Christianson had questions regarding the density in Mixed-Use Area E and the types of use allowed under that designation. He cited the following text from the Draft General Plan: "The intent for the portion of the mixed use area located from the southern Mission Road frontage south to San Tim creek is to promote both single-family residential as well as work/live artisan studio environment through a horizontal mixed use pattern. Single-family residential uses are intended along the street frontage and generally in the northern half of the mixed use area D-3 and the southern half bordering San Tim creek a work/live environment is intended. This is intended to feature single-family residences with studio/workshop buildings at the rear of the lot." He added that the text spelled out the appropriate density, as low density being 2.1 to 5 units per acre and medium density of 5.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre and verified that the 5.1 to 9 density is what the project was using. Senior Planner Lamson confirmed that the density of the project was calculated at 6.3 using the entire 15-acre parcel as required by law. She added that the density must be calculated as a gross density; that means that the entire acreage of the property including the five-acre Edison easement must be used. Ms. Lamson further explained that calculating the density without the five-acre Edison easement would result in a density of 9 units per acre, which is still in the range prescribed by the existing General Plan and the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out that, although no product was being presented, the project would offer a floor plan that would include a downstairs' office option equipped with the Loma Linda Connectivity program requirement could present a very attractive feature for someone who had a home office. He added that the feature would be located at the entrance to the house.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he understood that the project was within the parameters, legally. However, public testimony indicated concerns about the proximity to the preeminent historic location in Loma Linda.

Chair Neff suggested to Commissioner Christianson, that his concerns might be answered as the discussion moved through some of the other documents. He turned the discussion to the Negative Declaration and the Notice of Intent and Initial Study, more specifically at Section II – Environmental Checklist.

A discussion ensued regarding the Williamson Act contracts, which is defined as an area entirely designated for agricultural use. Ms. Lamson indicated that no part of the property included land that would come under the Williamson Act.

The discussion continued and turned to the issue of street lighting. Ms. Lamson explained that the lighting would not impact any nighttime views because the builder would have to implement the city standard streetlights that provide a shield to direct the light toward the street and the pedestrian sidewalks.

A discussion commenced regarding Noise issues. Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that as a policy the Commission decided to limit the construction of perimeter walls, and yet, the City requirements to mitigate the noise impact require walls be put up when we for years have not wanted walls to be constructed. Mr. Elssmann explained that with the reorientation of the homes on Mission Road, the need for a sound wall was eliminated. Senior Planner Lamson added the only sound wall that would be necessary would be a very small portion that would face Mission Road from the house to the side property line that could potentially be a gate.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that in order to protect and preserve the rear and side yard areas for a decibel reading of less than 65. However, if the setbacks were more than 35 feet, the builder could install a wood fence, otherwise if it is within the 35 feet, the building would have to mitigate by putting in a 6-foot high block wall to enclose the portion of that area that is adjacent to Mission Road, which is the noise source. Mr. Elssmann added that it was his objective was to develop an open quality un-walled community.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she wanted to be on record to say that she did not want a solid wall. Mr. Elssmann replied that he fully embraced that concept and that the orientation of the house to the front would mitigate that.

A discussion on construction ensued and resulted in a change in the construction hours to prohibit work between 6 pm and 7 am.

A discussion commenced about guest parking and the configuration of the north portion of the tract. Mr. Snell answered Commissioner Christianson's questions regarding the implementation of the parking regulations stating that guests and visitors would be authorized to park in the driveway, but that the final conditions would be presented when they came back with the Precise Plan of Design.

A discussion ensued regarding trash truck operation and circulation in the tract and concerns were mentioned regarding the trash truck's articulated arm that services trash receptacles on only one side of the street. Senior Planner Lamson that staff would work with Waste Management during the planning of the PPD as far as locations of the trash receptacles.

Commissioner Patel verified that the project would have a 4-sided architecture for the corner lots. Mr. Elssmann concurred.

None of the commissioners had any comments on the DA.

Commissioner Patel expressed concern regarding the very long straight block on Street A in the southern portion of the tract and asked if some type of architectural feature could be added to enhance the look of the street. Mr. Elssmann stated that the distance at that location was less than most streets in the community today.

Chair Neff verified that the street was 1,078 feet as indicated on the tract map. Commissioner Christianson concurred that Commissioner Patel was indeed right that the block was very long. Mr. Elssmann assured the Commission that a variety of architectural styles would be addressed in the PPD. Commissioner Patel stated that he was skeptical because whatever the builder did the street would still be a straight line. Mr. Elssmann replied that he had been working with the architect and staff on varying the setbacks, the rooflines, and the porches to make sure the situation was addressed. He added that the street actually does angle slightly from Van Leuven all the way back of the tract.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding a variety of features that would enhance the look of the street.

- Keep the end of the street open to connect with the trail system
- Add Pocket park access or additional trail connection to the Edison easement
- Reconfigure the lots & add more landscaping

Mr. Elssmann explained that effective ways of addressing the street scene issue would include the size and selection of trees to create a canopy effect in a timely manner, and a variety of elevation, colors and materials used to create character and interest. He added that there are 25 homes on each side of the street and that he would work very hard to address the issue.

Chair Neff concluded the discussion and suggested that those avenues be taken with the idea of addressing breaking it up with additional street trees, etc.

Chair Neff reopened Public hearing 9:20 pm to take public comment on the discussion.

Peter Cowley, Starr Street, Loma Linda expressed concerns on the density of the project and the parking issues.

A discussion commenced about changes to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Rosenbaum voiced her views in regards to small lot subdivision projects. She stated that the Commission had agreed to this type of development because the developers and builders were providing amenities that otherwise the City would not have. She continued to say that other tracts that were approved put in amenities such as a swimming pool, several parks, and tot lots, and BBQ pits. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that, in her opinion, this project was not providing any of those amenities, only a 5-acre of open space.

Mr. Elssmann interjected that he agreed with Commissioner Rosenbaum, but that the orientation of the property and the easement had not allow us to be more creative.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she had no issue with lot sizes or density. She stated that the project supported what the Planning Commission had asked for, but the open space that this project has could not be developed as well as the developer would have liked or give the City the amenities that it expected because the project cannot freely use the open space that they have, the 5 acres in the Edison easement, therefore cannot provide the amenities the Planning Commission had envisioned, i.e. larger green spaces where people can gather.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that when the Commission started down this path she did not recall any specifications about restricting this as unusable open space.

Chair Neff suggested that if there was a concern about the access to the landscaped area, the developer might consider adding another pathway can be made for easier access.

Commissioner Patel stated that the park amenities were not there. Commissioner Rosenbaum concurred with Commissioner Patel that this project was not providing their idea of open space and the amenities similar to what the Ryland Homes tract had to offer. Because this project was not free to put whatever they want in this easement because it's someone else's easement.

Chair Neff stated that in his opinion a park scenario was far better than a loud noisy poolside. Commissioner Rosenbaum reiterated that this project was not free to put whatever they want in this easement because it's someone else's easement. She continued to say that the Commission needed to clarify and define a policy that expressed what the City was expecting from small lot subdivisions.

Chair Neff stated that his preference sided with green scenery that almost resembled a golf course and that it was something very pleasing. He continued to ask staff if they had discussed amenities for this type of tract. Director Woldruff explained that the General Plan, the existing General Plan, had mandated in the Parks Element for 10 or more years, a goal of the City to develop the Edison easement as a walking trail and park, and that her thought was that the City was getting exactly what it had been asking for at no cost to the City. She added that she was of the same mind as Mayor Gaio Hansberger saying the it was quite enjoyable to be able to get out and walk a long distance and never have to really deal with traffic. Chair Neff suggested that this was a unique situation and that the City had benefited from improving a large green belt that will greatly enhance the City.

Mr. Elssmann stated the he appreciated Commissioner Rosenbaum comments. He continued to say that the Planning Commission would be interested in the fact that all new subdivisions coming to Mission Road, including Mission Trails tract, which is the Ryland Homes, the project now before for review, Mission Lane, and a third project, called Mission Creek, which would be submitted in the very near future would combine all of the amenities that Commissioner Rosenbaum was looking for i.e., a community pool, open space, basketball courts and tot lots in the Ryland Homes Tract, a 5-acre open space in the tract before you and tennis courts, volleyball courts, putting fields, a water element, half-court basketball courts added to that would be trail connectivity

Commissioner Christianson asked Mr. Elssmann if all three projects, Mission Trails at Ryland Homes, Mission Lane and Mission Creek would be accessible throughout the three projects and would be for public use. Ms. Lamson stated that it had been staff's intent that all three projects be connected.

Mr. Elssmann added that he wanted to share with the Commission the fact that he had had the opportunity to plan the whole region along with John Goodman for engineering, and American Pacific Homes, and to reassure the Planning Commission that they embraced the goals and principles that the commission had developed.

Director Woldruff explained to the Commission that most of the amenities included in the three projects were usable by everyone, except for the pool in Mission Trails Tract and added that what one project was lacking would be found in the others, and all within walking distance. Ms. Lamson added that the distance between Pepper and California was less than one mile.

Commissioner Patel suggested that if three or four homes were removed to provide areas for pocket parks and other amenities such as BBQ pits, and a little greenery added in different places would enhance the project both architecturally and esthetically.

Mr. Elssmann reminded the Planning Commission that one of the concepts that was iterated by Dan Burton was that amenities needed to be close by and stated that the 5-acre park was a 60-second walk away. He added that he would further explore to find a way to add some of those BBQs and amenities.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know how the project would address the concerns of those individuals on Pepper Way that indicated that their views would be drastically altered by the building heights.

Senior Planner Lamson addressed the issue and stated that there was no protected view shed in that location. She added that there was no guarantee that the view would be maintained for those property owners on Pepper Way and that those property owners had development rights as well.

Chair Neff added that the homes had wrap-around from the entrance to the homes and were side loaded, which can add additional enhancements. Mr. Elssmann explained that others would see the sides of the upstairs because of the varied setbacks and the way that the homes and footprints were designed particularly on the corners units would add some enhancement.

Senior Planner Lamson added comments to the view shed issue stating that there are areas in some communities, more specifically ocean front communities, that have view sheds that are protected, but that Loma Linda does not have any of those types of protected view sheds. She added that the land was very flat in that area.

Chair Neff directed staff to continue to work with the developer as far as adding additional landscaping or something that would provide some relief to the linearity of the road without making major change.

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Patel, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Christianson opposed, to recommend to the City Council to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration as modified, Approve and adopt Zone Change No. 03-06, based on the Findings, Approve the Development Agreement, Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 submitted on May 5, 2004 based on the Findings, and subject to the attached modified Conditions of Approval.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-26 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Chair Neff recommended that the review of the Draft General Plan be continued to the Special meeting of May 19, 2004.

Director Woldruff reminded the Commissioners that the Draft Environmental Impact Report was advertised to have a public hearing on May 19, 2004.

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked which issue needed to be addressed at the May 19, 2004 meeting and Director Woldruff explained that it was the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the other items still pending in the Draft General Plan itself, i.e. the Housing Element, the Implementation Programs, and the Hillside Mixed-use proposal. She added that she would like to dedicate the entire meeting on May 19, 2004 to the General Plan and try to get through the Environmental Impact Report, which is the remaining section and forward it to City Council.

PC-04-28 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Special meeting of January 14, 2004, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of February 4, 2004, and the Agenda Summary of the Joint city Council and Planning Commission General Plan Workshop of April 19, 2004.

There were no revisions to the above referenced minutes.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the Special meeting of January 14, 2004, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of February 4, 2004, and the Agenda Summary of the Joint city Council and Planning Commission General Plan Workshop of April 19, 2004, as presented by staff. (Essex absent)

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Planning Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff deferred her report to another meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to adjourn to a special meeting on May 19, 2004. (Essex absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Minutes approved at the special meeting of June 23, 2004

Administrative Secretary